



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT IMPORTANT DECISIONS.

BANKS AND BANKING—AUTHORITY OF CASHIER—WHEN KNOWLEDGE OF CASHIER IS NOT IMPUTED TO BANK.—Plaintiff's cashier induced defendant to sign a note, gratuitously, and deliver it to the bank, to be substituted for notes of the cashier, explaining to the defendant that it would not look well to the bank examiner for the bank to have its cashier's paper, and promising defendant that he would never be called upon to pay the note. A statute makes it a penal offense knowingly to make false entries in the books of a bank or knowingly to subscribe or exhibit false papers with intent to deceive the State bank examiner. *Held*, first, that the cashier had no authority to make defendant the promise he did; and, second, that defendant was charged with knowledge that the cashier's purpose was to violate the statute, but that the bank was not charged with the cashier's knowledge that defendant received nothing for the note. *State Bank of Moore v. Forsyth* (1910), — Mont. —, 108 Pac. 914.

The promise of the cashier that defendant would never be called upon to pay the note was altogether inoperative and void as an undertaking of the bank, and defendant acted upon it at his peril. 1 MORSE, BANKS & BANKING, Ed. 4, § 167; *Davis v. Randall*, 115 Mass. 547; *First Nat. Bank v. Tisdale*, 84 N. Y. 655. "A cashier is especially forbidden from releasing a debtor," 1 BOLLES, MOD. LAW OF BANKING, 361; *Hodge v. Bank*, 22 Grat. 51; *Sav. Assn. v. Sailor*, 63 Mo. 24; *Bank of U. S. v. Dunn*, 6 Pet. 51. Defendant was charged with notice of the statute—Rev. Codes, 4001—that the cashier was violating. Defendant could not, in connivance with the cashier, give the bank semblance of solidity and security, and then, when sued upon the note, escape the consequences of his fraudulent act. *Pauly v. O'Brien*, 69 Fed. 460. But the cashier's knowledge that defendant received nothing for the note could not be imputed to the bank. The ordinary rule of imputation of an agent's knowledge to his principal does not apply when the agent is acting adversely to his principal. *Bank of Ionia v. Montgomery*, 126 Mich. 327, 85 N. W. 879; *Graham v. Bank*, 59 N. J. L. 225, 35 Atl. 1053; *Fort Dearborn Bank v. Seymour*, 71 Minn. 81, 73 N. W. 724; *Dooley v. Hadden*, 179 U. S. 646, 45 L. Ed. 357. Nor if the conduct of the agent raises a clear presumption that he would not communicate the fact in controversy, as when to do so would necessarily prevent the consummation of a fraudulent scheme the agent was engaged in perpetrating. *Findley v. Cowles*, 93 Iowa 389, 61 N. W. 998; *Innerarity v. Bank*, 139 Mass. 332, 1 N. E. 282, 52 Am. Rep. 710; *Camden, etc. v. Lord*, 67 N. J. Eq. 489, 58 Atl. 607.

BILLS AND NOTES—TITLE TO PERSONALTY RETAINED AS COLLATERAL SECURITY—RIGHT OF TRANSFeree.—A company sold goods under a contract, retaining title until payment of the price. Purchase money notes were given and, subsequently, were transferred to a purchaser for value, without transfer of the contract. The transferee was ignorant of the existence of the